

ORIGINAL

Bob Stump



0000099386

W-01303A-08-0227

SW-01303A-08-0227

From:  
Sent:  
To:  
Subject:

mmfisher@cox.net  
Wednesday, May 27, 2009 1:56 AM  
Stump-Web  
Arizona American Water

RECEIVED

2009 JUN 16 A 10:20

Dear Mr. Stump:

AZ CCAP COMMISSION  
DOCKET CONTROL

I know Arizona American Water is contemplating a water rate increase that, once again, will be based on the size of the meter, as opposed to the actual consumption of water. While I do have a pool, I attempt to conserve water at every opportunity, including all desert landscaping. Water rates based upon meter size as opposed to actual consumption of water is counter to good water conservation practice, and places a burden on those who do try to conserve.

In approximately April, 2007, my Arizona American Water bill contained a notice regarding an arsenic recovery surcharge, stating in part "it is estimated that this surcharge will increase the average residential customer bill by \$34.91 a month (based on average usage in Paradise Valley of 44,270 gallons per month)."

Since I attempt to conserve water, as we all should, I use less than 25,000 gallons per month and expected my bill to increase by no more than the \$34.91 a month.

Imagine my shock when I received my bill: \$90.37 for Arsenic Recovery with no detail. I called Arizona American Water, whose customer service rep told me that she didn't know how it was computed, but it was a one time charge.

I knew that to be false, so I went to the town of Paradise Valley, who provided me with a page from a presentation by the company, which showed a charge of \$79.65 per month for having a 2" meter, not a function of how much water you consume, but rather the size of the meter. The meter was put in by my builder because of the low water pressure which the predecessor company achieved, and has never been a function of the amount of water used.

It seems unconscionable to me that the Arizona Corporation Commission could approve such a service charge, given that the arsenic recovery fee is provided to remove the arsenic from the water used, rather than relate it to the size of the meter, which in no way correlates to water consumption. De facto, I am being penalized for conserving water, while having a 2" meter to provide me reasonable water pressure.

The effect of the ruling has been to nearly triple my water bill, and, since the charge has been ongoing for over 2 years, there is no end in sight. Ironically, the water taste is so poor, arsenic or not, we never drink it: we drink bottled water instead.

I appreciate that you have a busy schedule, and wonder if there is anything I can do, as an individual consumer.

Thank you for listening to my rant. If nothing else, I feel I have gotten my issue off my chest.

Mike Fisher  
6400 East Joshua Tree Lane  
Paradise Valley, Arizona 85253  
telephone: 480-596-1506

Arizona Corporation Commission

DOCKETED

JUN 16 2009

DOCKETED BY	
-------------	--